



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

declares that the foundation stone is Christ: "We are namely founded not on Peter, but on the rock, Christ" (ix. 35).

(4) The efficiency of the intercession of the saints in favor of sinners is flatly denied by Fidati (xii. 15): they can help neither through their power nor through their merits: "*totum agitur in nomine salvatoris.*"

As to the question whether Luther used Fidati's book positive proof is not forthcoming, since Luther rarely quoted the sources of his thought. The value of Müller's work is rather in giving new support for the contention that Luther's ideas were not wholly new, that something of them was in the atmosphere. There was some light before sunrise, "splendori antelucani," as Dante says. Fidati belonged to the elect company of those seers who to the call, "Watchman, what of the night?" answer, "The morning cometh."

ROBERT H. PFEIFFER.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

### MACLER'S ARMENIAN GOSPELS

*Le texte arménien de l'évangile d'après Matthieu et Marc par Frédéric Macler. Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque des études, tome 28, Paris, 1919, pp. lxxii + 647.*

The well-known Armenist of the École Nationale des Langues Orientales Vivantes at Paris, Professor Frédéric Macler, has laid New Testament scholars and those who are interested in the Caucasian languages, more particularly Armenian, under a decided obligation by the publication of this elaborate study of the text of Matthew and Mark in the Armenian version. What makes the book of especial value is the fact that we have here a large number of variants drawn from Mss. which were inaccessible to the editor of the only variorum edition of the Armenian text hitherto published — that of Zohrab, Venice, 1805. This is peculiarly grateful to the Armenist, while the New Testament critic finds a large body of readings from various Armenian Mss. or manuscript groups collected, translated, analyzed, and compared with the Greek, the Old Syriac, and the Peshitto by a competent scholar.

Macler, however, is not content with giving the raw materials, but marshals the evidence with considerable skill in support of certain theses which he is maintaining. A short outline of the book will

make this clear. After the introductory material and bibliography comes an historical introduction in two chapters, of which the first is entitled, 'Données historiques sur la question chez les auteurs arméniens anciens,' wherein are discussed (pp. xxvii-xxxiv) the statements by Koriun, Lazar of P'arp, Moses of Khorene, and the so-called 'little' Koriun. Macler concludes that the Scriptures were translated from the Greek by Sahak or Mashtots, and that the later tradition regarding Syrian activities in Moses of Khorene is incorrect. In the second chapter, 'Le problème envisagé par les modernes' (pp. xxxiv-lxxii), he discusses the views of other scholars, incidentally controverting Armitage Robinson's statements in his *Euthaliana*.

The Mss. themselves fall into two main groups, which Macler calls Z and Mq. To the group Z, which in the main reproduce Zohrab's text, belong: M (A.D. 902?), Venice, Mekh. 1144; E (A.D. 989), Echmiadzin 229<sup>1</sup>; B (A.D. 1053), Echmiadzin 363; D (A.D. 1066), Echmiadzin 369; F (A.D. 1099), Echmiadzin 257. Apparently these all go back to the same archetype. The Mss. of the group Mq are made up of the following: Mq itself (A.D. 887), Lazarev Institute, Moscow; A (A.D. 1045), Echmiadzin 23 G; H (A.D. 1007), Venice, Mekh. 887; C (A.D. 1057), Echmiadzin 362 G. F seems to bear some relation to the Mq group.

Macler takes up the Mss., discussing the variants by categories. Mq is first treated (pp. 2-47), and the author comes to the conclusion that, although inaccurate, it contains good readings and is synthetic in character rather than representing any one actual type (p. 47). H (pp. 47-57) seems to be an inaccurate copy of a Ms. of the Mq type, but revised to bring it nearer the Greek. A contains, beside a number of errors, many "arbitrary" readings (pp. 57-93). C shows many dialectical and grammatical variations, as well as "arbitrary" readings: it stands close to A, and its language bears some relation to the grecophil school of translators (pp. 93-165). Macler's conclusion is that the Mq group has no inner unity, but that the variants which we meet in it go back to various types of Greek Mss., and he denies almost completely the notion of Syriac influence. The Mss. of the Z group, on the contrary, prove to be relatively closely related to one another, as far as M, B, D, and E are concerned (pp. 168-270); F seems to stand between Z and Mq (pp. 271-315).

The second part of the work consists of a comparison of the Armenian text with the other versions (pp. 317-402), first of all with

<sup>1</sup> This Ms. is described by Macler in *Nouvelles archives des missions scientifiques*, N. S., fasc. 2, Paris, 1910, pp. 27-37.

the Old Latin, where there is naturally but little agreement. Next comes the question of Syriac influence, and a discussion of the coincidences and disagreements between Z and the Peshitto. Before showing that the *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe* cannot be the original of the Armenian translation, he discusses the Peshitto, and endeavors to explain away the coincidences by adducing variants from various Greek Mss. The chapter (pp. 403–568) entitled ‘*La technique de la traduction,*’ is particularly interesting. Macler’s thesis is that the Armenian “*semble calqué sur la grec.*”

The final fourth chapter, “*Examen des variants portant sur le fond*” (pp. 569–637), is devoted to a discussion of the type of Greek Ms. to which the archetype of our Armenian codices is most closely related. Macler comes to the conclusion (p. 631) that ‘*la traduction arménienne repose sur un manuscrit grec de la famille que von Soden désigne par I: ce manuscrit est apparenté en particulier au Codex Bezae et à l’Évangile de Koridethi,*’ although he qualifies this statement by admitting that certain of the peculiarities of D are not found in the Armenian. After touching on the disagreement of the Armenian with both the Syriac and the Greek (pp. 632–637), he discusses the variant *dalmaterên*, ‘in Dalmatian’ (Lc. 23, 38; Jo. 19, 20) for *γράμμασι . . . ῥωμαϊκοῖς*, which he considers to be evidence that the Armenian Gospels were translated in the time of Justinian, the most important Byzantine emperor from Dalmatia.

The reviewer of this painstaking and careful work cannot but express his regret that (apart from the grave blemish of the lack of an index) certain omissions and commissions materially diminish its value. First of all, it is a great pity that complete collations of the several Mss. are not given. The reader is not put in a position to form his own judgment, but is forced to deal with the author’s collections, themselves made to illustrate a theory. Secondly, the author is bound by the prevailing superstition that the oldest and calligraphically most perfect Mss. exhibit the best text. *Éditions de luxe* are objects of dubious value, and the elegant scribe is rarely a good scholar. Failure to recognize this has done incalculable harm to textual criticism, both of the biblical text and in classical philology. One has only to grasp the relation of Codex B in some books of the Bible to its minuscule congeners to see how often the latter have the true reading, while the uncial Mss. of Vergil stand far behind the better minuscules in value. Mq in particular is a very inaccurate Ms. Moreover, although the discussion of the various authorities

<sup>2</sup> R. Duval, *La littérature syriaque*,<sup>3</sup> Paris 1907, pp. 37–42.

is valuable as a collection of opinions, the critical estimates are in many cases crude. The writer seems to give more weight to the *consensus opinionum multorum* than to the actual critical value of the remarks themselves, which for the most part is almost nil: the New Testament scholars are generally unacquainted with Armenian, while the Armenists are almost all wholly ignorant of the principles of New Testament criticism. As to the Armenian tradition about the translation itself, it seems to the reviewer highly unsafe to cast overboard the Syriac tradition as we have it in Moses of Khorene and to adhere to the violently partisan statements of such rabid grecophils as Lazar of P'arp and Koriun. Macler has not given due weight to the fact that the truthfulness of Moses of Khorene has of late been rehabilitated; if he cites Carrière, why not also Marr's work? The fact that Moses of Khorene is later than the other writers does not militate against the value of the sources which he used. A further very serious gap in the book lies in the fact that the Georgian tradition, which gives us the oldest accessible form of the Armenian text, is not used by the writer, when V. N. Beneševič's edition (St. Petersburg, 1909-11) must surely have been accessible to him. This is based on the Opiza gospels (A.D. 913). Still more important are the Adysh gospels, now published in a magnificent phototypic edition by E. S. Taqaishvili.<sup>3</sup> This Ms. dates from the year 897, and the text seems quite independent of the Greek.

The view seems highly doubtful that our Armenian Mss. actually descend from a single archetype, and that it is possible to recognize this among existing Greek Mss. An examination of the evidence regarding the Armenian translators will show, I think, that Sahak was engaged in an opposition to Syriac translators. We know that up to the beginning of the fifth century the Diatessaron was the prevailing gospel text in use among the Mesopotamian Syrians, but that Rab-bula's revision met with an immediate success with all parties;<sup>4</sup> is it not, then, likely that the Syriac missionaries would at once translate the gospels into Armenian? We have evidence from Georgian sources<sup>5</sup> of the activity of the Nestorian translators in the fifth century.

<sup>3</sup> Материалы по археологии Кавказа, выпускъ 16, Moscow, 1916. The date of the Ms. is disputed, but the preponderance of evidence for the earlier date as given in the text is very decided.

<sup>4</sup> See F. C. Burkitt in *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, II, pp. 161-164, Cambridge, 1904.

<sup>5</sup> See the tractate of the Georgian Katalikozi Arseni on the schism between Armenians and Georgians in *Zordania*, *Kronikebi*, etc., I. Tiflis, 1892, pp. 313 ff., especially p. 325.

Caucasian problems are complicated, and Caucasian languages are not bound by a classical tradition as was Greek. The processes of retranslation and revision went on almost uninterruptedly. Surely the history of the multiform versions of the Scriptures in Syriac and Georgian should be a warning against an undue simplification of the problem in Armenian. Then, too, the earlier history of the Koridethi Ms. is highly problematical, especially its localization at Martyropolis,<sup>6</sup> nor is there the slightest evidence to connect Codex Bezae with Asia Minor. The *dalmaterēn* of Luke 23, 38, John 19, 20 is curious indeed, but we should note that there is no canonical translation or transliteration for the word 'Latin' in the Oriental languages. In some old Georgian texts we have for 'Roman' the form *p'romini*, which is so far an absolute enigma.<sup>7</sup> That Justinian was reigning in Constantinople would hardly have caused Latin to be called 'Dalmatian' on the Armenian border. It is far more probably due to the fact of Dalmatian troops being stationed there for a considerable period.<sup>8</sup> A reading of this sort need not point to exceptionally good knowledge of things imperial on the part of the translator, nor is the possibility excluded that the reading, after being once established in the text, was taken over by Mss. of a different version.

In fine, there are many serious objections to Professor Macler's arguments. He makes out a good case for the absence of any direct connection between the Old Syriac and the Armenian, and also for the preponderance of Greek influence in the gospel text, but he can only explain the numerous coincidences between it and the Peshitto by scraping together variants from many diverse types of Greek Mss. Would not the more natural supposition be that a translation from the Syriac formerly existed and has influenced our present text?

ROBERT P. BLAKE.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

<sup>6</sup> This word is a very problematical expansion of an obscure contraction, nor is *Τεφρικη* certain either. See the text of the adscription, p. 498, and Beermann's discussion of the same, pp. 569 ff. in Beermann and Gregory's edition, Leipzig, 1913.

<sup>7</sup> This form is found in the Georgian version of Epiphanius, *περὶ τῶν ἰβ' λίθων*, Ms. 1141 (ca. A.D. 970) of the Georgian Literary Society (Šatberd Ms.) p. 129a = ed. Джанашвили, p. 26; in the *Passio ss. martt. Ivlianos et Evbulos, Tevdoros et Malkamon, Mokimen et Salamone*, Ms. 341 (inc. aetatis) of the Georgian Society of History and Ethnology, f. 209r; in Acts 16, 21 of Ms. 407 of the Georgian Literary Society, quaternio 30, f. 2r (236).

<sup>8</sup> Cf. V. Chapot, *La frontière de l'Euphrate de Pompée à la conquête arabe*, Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et Rome, fasc. 99, Paris, 1907, pp. 100-108.